

## REMARKS

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 5, 11, 13 and 15 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry of the following arguments are respectfully requested. Therefore, claims 1-17 are pending and under reconsideration is requested.

### AMENDMENT TO THE SPECIFICATION

In accordance with the comments noted by the Examiner in the Office Action, that "the twelve fixed points are not on the imaginary circle...[o]nly the projections thereof are...", applicants note that paragraph [0024] of the specification has been amended to state that, "the fixed positions of the all wires W1-W6 appear to be located on a circumference of the imaginary circle C." Thus, it is believed that the specification is now clear on its face as to the meaning of the disclosure. It is also believed that, since the amendment to the specification is clearly supported by FIG. 6 and the original disclosure, no new matter has been entered.

### ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Regarding the indication of the allowability of claims 3, 4, 8-10 and 17, it is noted that, since the §112, 1st paragraph issue have been clarified, these claims should be in condition for formal allowance at this time.

### REJECTIONS UNDER §102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 11-16 have been rejected under § 102(e) as being anticipated by Takeshita (US Patent No. 6,775,207 B2). This rejection is traversed.

Regarding the rejection of claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 recites a servo-mechanism to drive the blade in a plurality of directions and a plurality of elastic support members, to support the blade, the elastic support members being elastically movable with respect to the blade and located **outside** of the servo-mechanism.

Conversely, the reference to Takeshita shows that the linear elastic bodies 7a-7f, which are cited as corresponding to the claimed elastic support members, are located **inside** of the permanent magnets 11 and 12, which appear to correspond to the claimed servo-mechanism.

Therefore, the claimed invention is patentably distinguished from the reference to Takeshita and it is believed that the rejection of claim 1 is overcome.

Regarding the rejections of claims 2, 5-7 and 11-16, it is believed that these rejections are also overcome for at least substantially similar reasons as set forth above with respect to the allowability of claim 1 because claims 2, 5-7 and 11-16 are either independent claims that recite somewhat similar subject matter as claim 1 with respect to the elastic support members or depend from an otherwise allowable independent claim.

## CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues. If there are any additional fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 50-3333

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI LLP

By: 

Howard I. Levy  
Registration No. 55,378

1400 I Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 216-9505  
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510

Date: 7/22/05